

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

WILLIAM T. ANTEPENKO, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 17-cv-1356-pp

LISA VAN PAY,

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
(DKT NO. 33)**

On December 12, 2018, the court granted the defendant's motion to dismiss and entered judgment. Dkt. Nos. 26, 27. About a week later, the court received the plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. Dkt. No. 28. The court denied the motion on January 24, 2019. Dkt. No. 32. The court explained to the plaintiff that his disagreement with the court's decision was not a sufficient basis to establish that the court had made a mistake. Id. at 2.

A couple of weeks later, the court received from the plaintiff a second motion for reconsideration. Dkt. No. 33. The plaintiff argues that the court misinterpreted several of the exhibits the court examined when reaching its decision. Id. The court addressed these arguments in its original decision granting the defendant's motion to dismiss and in its decision denying the plaintiff's first motion for reconsideration. See Dkt. Nos. 26, 32. The court understands that the plaintiff disagrees with the court's decision, but that is not a reason for the court to change that decision. The court will not consider

any further motions for reconsideration. If the plaintiff believes that the court made mistakes in its ruling, the appropriate thing for him to do is to file an appeal to a higher court.

The court **DENIES** the plaintiff's second motion for reconsideration. Dkt. No. 33.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 16th day of May, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Pepper', written over a horizontal line.

HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge